

KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321)  
 United States Attorney

MARK L. KROTOSKI (CSBN 138549)  
 Chief, Criminal Division

ANDREW M. SCOBLE (CSBN 124940)  
 Assistant United States Attorney

450 Golden Gate Ave.  
 San Francisco, California 94102  
 Telephone: (415) 436-7249  
 Fax: (415) 436-7234

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	No.: CR 06-0428 SI
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<del>[PROPOSED]</del> ORDER EXCLUDING
	)	TIME FROM SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
v.	)	<u>CALCULATION</u>
	)	
RICHARD WONG,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

This matter came on for hearing before the Court on August 3, 2006. Defendant Richard Wong appeared with his counsel, Ean Vizzi. The United States appeared through Assistant U.S. Attorney Andrew M. Scoble. The defendant was arraigned, entered not guilty pleas, and was released on a secured bond pursuant to conditions agreed upon by the parties.

The parties represented that the government has previously provided voluminous discovery materials (according to the government, it includes more than 150,000 pages of images, plus DVD's and CD-ROMs as well as videotapes) to other defense counsel for other defendants charged in this and related cases. Defense counsel noted additionally that there are

ORDER EXCLUDING TIME

1 new counsel who have recently entered appearances in this complex case. Defense counsel and  
2 the defendant, along with the government, requested the continuance and agreed that a Speedy  
3 Trial Act exclusion is appropriate under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8), based upon counsel's need to  
4 review the discovery and become familiar with the case, and agreed that the continuance is  
5 necessary to provide reasonable time for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of  
6 due diligence.

7 The next date for this case is September 1, 2006 at 11:00 a.m. before United States  
8 District Judge Susan Illston.

9 Accordingly, THE COURT FINDS that a continuance from August 3, 2006 through and  
10 including September 1, 2006 is appropriate, and that the ends of justice served by granting such a  
11 continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. THE  
12 COURT FURTHER FINDS that failure to grant such a continuance would deny the defendant  
13 and his counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of the case (including  
14 review of the voluminous discovery), taking into account the exercise of due diligence. THE  
15 COURT THEREFORE ORDERS that the period from August 3, 2006 through September 1,  
16 2006 is excludible time within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) & (B)(iv).

17  
18 DATED: 8/4/6

